

Remarks/Arguments

The above-referenced application has been reviewed in light of the Examiner's Non-Final Office Action dated March 30, 2010. Applicants are grateful for the Examiner's acknowledgement of allowable subject matter in Claims 3-5, 7, and 20-33. By the present amendment, Claim 34 has been amended without introducing new matter. Therefore, Claims 3-5, 7, and 20-34 are currently pending in this case. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested, particularly in view of at least the following remarks.

Summary of the Examiner's Rejections

In accordance with the Office Action, Claim 34 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizutani et al. (USPN: 6392620, "Mizutani") in view of Surguy (USPN: 5233338, "Surguy").

Regarding the Rejections

Applicants respectfully submit Claim 34 in the application is patentable for at least the following reasons.

Amended Claim 34 recites, *inter alia*, that in one frame, at least one of the M scanning areas displays a corresponding gray by the applied normal data signals, and the at least one of the M scanning areas displays a corresponding

black gray by the applied black data signals.

At the very least, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest the above features of amended Claim 34.

For example, in contrast to the embodiment claimed in amended Claim 34, in Mizutani there is only a general disclosure that there is a non-display period where the light source is turned off to display a black image, that is, no data signal is applied while the black image is displayed, or the liquid crystal device may be driven so as to effect a black image. See, e.g., Col. 3, line 60 – col. 4, line 17 and Figs. 3A and 3B of Mizutani. However, Mizutani fails to explicitly disclose or suggest that “in one frame, at least one of the M scanning areas displays a corresponding gray by the applied normal data signals, and the at least one of the M scanning areas displays a corresponding black gray by the applied black data signals”, as recited in amended claim 34. Also, Surguy does not cure the deficiencies in Mizutani.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, amended Claim 34 is patentable over Mizutani in view of Surguy.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the stated grounds of rejections have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Accordingly, an early and favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Michael F. Morano
Reg. No. 44,952
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Mailing Address:
F. Chau & Associates, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889